in the battle, Colonel Chamberlain realized his regiment was in dire straits. Out of ammunition and outnumbered following the last assault, he ordered his men to fix bayonets and led a bold assault against the Confederates that took them completely by surprise. The stunned enemy soldiers were defeated and fell back in disarray. The men of the 20th Maine swept their brigade's whole front and wanted to go farther, but Colonel Chamberlain's outstanding skill as a leader allowed him to maintain control of his soldiers and move them back into position.

The outcome of the Battle of Gettysburg and the fate of the United States were determined by many factors in that time but none so telling as the bayonet charge of the 20th Maine. Colonel Chamberlain's leadership allowed his regiment to hold the line and the Union Army to win the battle.

Another example of the importance of leadership to success in battle is our 1991 victory in the Persian Gulf War. Although we faced a numerically superior force that had had months to prepare, we were able to deploy our forces, seize the initiative, and decisively defeat the Iraqi Army. Outstanding leadership at all levels was responsible for that victory.

As one specific example of this success, a young cavalry scout with the 3d Armored Division evacuated the crew and organized a hasty defense after his Bradley was hit by enemy fire. Although he was severely wounded himself, he was able to direct his platoon to his position and still place effective fire on an Iraqi squad.

To include *Leadership* as a Principle of War, we must first understand the term. FM 100-5 states that leadership provides purpose, direction, and motivation in combat; it also describes leadership as the process of influencing others to accomplish a mission. We can combine these two ideas somewhat to come up with an acceptable definition: *For every military operation, the leader must provide the task, purpose, and motivation.* In order to do this the leader must apply all of the Principles of War, including his ability to influence others to accomplish the mission.

In past wars, our success has always depended on the outstanding leadership displayed by U.S. soldiers at all levels and in all branches. Our future success, given the wide variety of contingencies we must prepare for, will continue to depend on competent leadership. This is why I believe *Leadership* should be our tenth Principle of War.

Captain Richard A. Turner commanded an antiarmor company in the 3d Armored Division, a Bradley company in the division during Operation DESERT STORM, and now commands headquarters company, 2d Battalion, 11th Infantry. He is a 1983 graduate of the United States Military Academy.

Evaluation Reports
Whom Do We Really Reward?

MAJOR JOSE M. MARRERO

As military professionals, we all want to be treated fairly at rating time, and our subordinates expect the same. But whom do we really reward in our evaluations and our daily activities? Do we reward the soldiers who most deserve it? What specific traits do we reward? And are we aware that when we reward one subordinate, we send a message to all the others? That message is, "This is how it's done. These are the traits we want to see in this unit."

Let's look at an example:

A captain receives a less than outstanding officer evaluation report (OER) and has trouble understanding why. After all, during the rating period, he made sure the battalion commander saw him in action and saw his company in the best light. He chatted with the colonel, impressed him with astute observations, and joked around with him, all to foster a closer relationship. He took pains to show he was in control of everything. He always had his uniform pressed and his boots shined. Who deserved a better rating than he did?

He complained to the colonel, "This is the first time in my military career that I received anything less than outstanding on an OER. You've seen how good my company is. And no one can question my loyalty to you. Every time you asked me to do something, I was there. I came through, whatever it was. You could always count on me."

He was surprised at the colonel's

response: "Yes, you've always been there for me! *Not for your soldiers. I rate an officer "outstanding" only if he is loyal in every respect. A loyal leader doesn't just serve his superiors; he serves his subordinates as well.*

"Are you making sure your soldiers get what they need? Food? Medical care? Good equipment? The best training possible so they won't needlessly become casualties in combat? That's what your superiors want. Take care of your soldiers, not just when the boss is around but all the time. Do you think the boss has to be there to know how you're doing? Take care of your men, captain. Look at what they do, and look at what they get for it.

"And that's not your only problem. You're not a team player; you always have to try to be the star! Now don't get me wrong. We need stars. But don't glorify yourself at the expense of the others on your team. Let them take the credit due them. After all, they're your buddies—leaders, just like you."

We should ask ourselves whether we reward the right people or the right traits. Do we reward long work hours instead of efficiency? Do we appreciate it when our leaders insist on modest, economical products, or do we prefer to see our budgets wasted on window dressing that makes their products look more attractive? Are we more impressed by people who talk about their accomplishments, or by those who let their work speak for itself? Do we reward quantity or quality? Effusiveness or efficiency? Exhibition or industry?

Every human being, regardless of his intellectual capacity, is motivated by the possible consequences of his actions. He does his work best when he expects to be rewarded for it in some fashion. If every leader, no matter what his rank, can find a way to motivate each of his subordinates, he can significantly increase productivity.

Motivating through rewards is a part of leadership, and rewards need not be written. Rewarding people while a project is under way often produces better results than waiting until the project is completed. Similarly, giving a soldier free time is often a better or fairer reward than a medal. Simply giving a subordinate a "Well done!" may also be appropriate.

What a leader does or does not do also communicates something to his subordinates. If he ignores the apparent laziness of a few soldiers while making his way through a training area, he is rewarding negative behavior as much as if he overlooks deficiencies during a formal inspection.Similarly, if he fails to reward a subordinate's good behavior, he diminishes the value of that behavior in the eyes of the subordinate, and also diminishes the likelihood that the behavior will continue.

The next time we are tempted to reward someone, let's stop and think: Are we about to reward appearance or substance? We might even ask whether we may have shared in creating officers such as the captain in the example. Could it be that this captain started out on the right track, only to notice that those who sought their own reward were the ones who got it?

Many officers—guided by the professional, societal, or moral definitions of loyalty—live their brand of loyalty to the letter, whether they are properly rewarded or not. They focus on their respective unit missions. They know what *moderation* and *balance* mean. They are tactful. They *work* instead of talking about work. And no matter how successful they may be, they do not become arrogant, lest they lose the proper focus.

Let's take a good look at our units and soldiers, then ask ourselves again: Whom do we really reward? The answer should reveal the traits we value most in our subordinates.

Major Jose M. Marrero has served in various Field Artillery positions including battery commander, fire support team chief, and battalion fire support officer. He recently completed an assignment as an instructor in field artillery and tactics at the U.S. Army School of the Americas, Fort Benning, and is now in a graduate program at Vanderbilt University. He is a graduate of the University of Puerto Rico.

Tactical Use of "Snowmachines"

CAPTAIN KEITH W. RICHARD

When "snowmachines" were introduced in Alaska, they changed a way of living that was centuries old. (In Alaska, all "snowmobiles" are called "snowmachines," because the former term does not translate as easily from the native languages.) In remote villages throughout the state, these vehicles have assumed roles formerly filled by dog teams. While dog teams are still a routine method of transportation from village to village, snowmachines offer definite advantages, allowing movement that is free of the logistics required to operate a team of dogs.